

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. In the Office Action of January 13, 2005, the Examiner objected to Claims 8 and 10 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but stated that Claims 8 and 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, in the interests of expediting prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended Claims 8 and 10 as suggested by the Examiner. In doing so, Applicants are not acceding to the Examiner's rejection of any other pending Claims in this application. Applicants believe that this response addresses the Examiner's rejection and that any changes do not introduce new matter into the specification, limit the scope of the claims or result in any prosecution history estoppel.

Claim Rejections:

35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-7, 9, and 11-20

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 9, and 11-20 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bishay et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,364) in view of Bulman (U.S. Patent No. 6,351,265). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully maintain that neither Bishay nor Bulman, alone or in combination, provide the subject matter of the rejected claims. As the Examiner correctly notes, Bishay "does not teach comparing relative changes in hue and the relative weights depending, at least in part, on the difference in hue in one particular direction relative to another" (Office Action; page 3). The Examiner goes on to state that Bishay "teaches using relative changes in intensity values (brightness) of neighboring pixels to detect an edge" (emphasis added) (Office Action; page 3). Thus the Examiner acknowledges that Bishay does not disclose the claimed invention, and, moreover, that Bishay teaches using intensity values to detect edges.

Applicants respectfully assert that Bishay does not disclose ***computing a color signal value for that particular pixel location for a color plane other than the color plane of the pixel signal value in***

*the subsampled color image at that location, **the computation including relatively weighing the relative changes in hue**, the relative weights depending, at least in part, on the difference in hue value in one particular direction relative to the other* as recited in Claim 1. Rather, Applicants assert that Bishay discloses using edge detection kernels to generate intensity values for the purposes of detecting edges but does not disclose using relative changes in intensity values to compute color signal values. Applicants respectfully assert that Bulman does not correct the deficiencies of Bishay in this regard.

The reasoning provided above applies similarly to rejected independent Claims 13, 16, and 19. In conclusion, Applicants respectfully maintain that neither Bishay nor Bulman, alone or in combination, provide the subject matter of the rejected claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-7, 9, and 11-20 is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that all of the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance.

Should it be determined that an additional fee is due under 37 CFR §§1.16 or 1.17, or any excess fee has been received, please charge that fee or credit the amount of overcharge to deposit account #02-2666.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 264-6473. Reconsideration of this patent application and early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert D. Hinchliffe
Patent Agent
Intel Corporation
Reg. No. 55,268

Dated: July 11, 2005

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
1925 NW Amberglen Parkway, Suite 230
Beaverton, OR 97006
(503) 439-8778